Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes changes to Figs. 7 and 8. This sheet, which includes Figs. 5-8, replaces the original sheet including Figs. 5-8.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

Remarks

Claims 1-26 are pending in the application, and each was rejected. By this paper, claims 1, 9 and 19 are amended. Based on the following, consideration of the amended claims, and reconsideration of the remaining claims, are requested.

Drawings

By this paper, Figures 7 and 8 are amended to change their respective labels. The original drawings files with this application inadvertently labeled Figure 7 as Figure 8, and vice versa. The amended drawings correct this inadvertent error, making the drawing labels consistent with the text of the specification.

Claim Rejections—35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, the Examiner states with regard to claims 1 and 9 that "it is unclear how the system parameter value is being measured...." By this paper, claims 1 and 9 are amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. For example, the preambles to amended claims 1 and 9 recite "[a] method for providing data for a data table in a controller configured to process data from a system having at least one parameter with a value that can be measured...." The bodies of amended claims 1 and 9 recite "measuring a value of a parameter of the system," which, by means of the term "the system" particularly references the system referred to in the preamble of the respective claim.

As for how the value of the parameter is measured, Applicants note that the present invention as recited in amended claim 1 and amended claim 9 contemplates the method for providing data for a data table as applied to a variety of systems and a variety of parameters

-10-

within any given system. Therefore, "how" a system parameter value is measured will depend, at least in part, on what the parameter is.

For example, a system parameter value can be measured directly, as in the case of the parameter being a time for the occurrence of an event. The Specification at Paragraph 0024 describes a system parameter being a time for a transmission shift to occur. The value of the parameter—i.e., the duration of the event—can be measured directly by a clock. Although the use of the clock is not specifically discussed, the use of a clock is inherent with regard to time measurement. As another example, Paragraph 0021 of the Specification describes a data table that stores information related to transmission oil pressure, and further describes that the transmission oil pressure is directly related to transmission oil temperature and engine speed. If the transmission oil pressure is the system parameter under consideration, it can be measured directly with one or more pressure switches, or it can be inferred from the measurement of the transmission oil temperature and/or the engine speed. Such techniques are well known to those in the art, and for any given system parameter under consideration, there may be a variety of ways to measure its value. The Specification has provided one such example—e.g., the time for a shift to occur—and Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 9 need no further support to make them definite.

The Examiner also states that "it is unclear what the current system is as stated at line 10 of claim 1." Amended claim 1 recites "reading a value from a first data cell in the data table, the first data cell corresponding to current conditions of the system...." Again, reciting "conditions of the system" particularly references the system recited in the preamble. Throughout the Specification, one type of system—i.e., a vehicle powertrain system—is described in detail, thereby providing ample support for the language of amended claim 1. Moreover, as noted above, it is contemplated that the present invention can be applied to a variety of systems; therefore, Applicants submit that the method for providing data for a data table as recited in amended claim 1 is not indefinite. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request the rejections to claims 1 and 9 to be withdrawn.

By this paper, claim 19 is also amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The preamble of amended claim 19 now defines the system as one "having at least one parameter with a value that can be measured," and the body of amended claim 19 particularly references the system recited in the preamble.

Addressing the Examiner's concerns regarding "how the respective target values are being a function of at least the determined error and the value read from a first data cell, and wherein the error is determined based on the difference between a measured parameter value and a predetermined value," Applicants provide the following explanation. Amended claim 19 recites "determining an error based on the difference between a measured value of a parameter of the system and a predetermined value...." Therefore, it is clear from this language how the error is determined.

Amended claim 19 also recites that "each of the respective target values [is] a function of at least the determined error and a value read from a first of the data cells." Therefore, it is clear from this language that the data is read from a cell that belongs to the plurality of data cells recited in the preamble. Thus, the respective target values are a function of known quantities. Because the quantities are known, they can be combined to form any of a variety of different functions. Just as an example, the Specification at Paragraph 0038 recites one mathematical formula that defines such a function, while the surrounding text of the Specification fully describes each of the variables. Therefore, Applicants submit that amended claim 19 meets the requirements of § 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request the rejection to be withdrawn.

Amended claims 1, 9 and 19 are the base claims for claims 2-8, 10-18 and 20-26, respectively. As discussed above, each of the base claims is believed to be allowable; therefore each of these dependent claims is also believed to be allowable. Accordingly, allowance of each of the pending claims is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen Cicala et al.

By _Marc F. Malooley_
Marc F. Malooley
Reg. No. 50,624
Attorney/Agent for Applicant

Date: December 15, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351